

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N) .	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/601,738	10/601,738 06/23/2003		Volker Pretzlaff	KOA 0234 PUS (R 1381)	7534	
22045	7590	02/13/2006		EXAMINER		
	S KUSHM		NGUYEN, NAM V			
	SECOND	· - -	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SOUTHF	ELD, MI	48075	2635			
				DATE MAILED: 02/13/2000	DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/601,738	PRETZLAFF ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Nam V. Nguyen	2635		

	Nam v. Nguyen	2030	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>1/23/06</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA	TION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOW	ANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a National Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	ng date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final reject	ion.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) o TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of e under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office lat may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	xtension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origer than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any ext a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be file			e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection They raise new issues that would require further c 	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ecause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE bel	•	TE Delow),	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	3):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	·	•	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is properties that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good awas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanati	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ut does NOT place the application is	a condition for allowed	noo boooyoo
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	•		nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	(F10/56/06 OF P10-1449) Paper N	iu(s)	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Referring to Claims 1-3,5-8 and 10-11, Kurita disloses a commander main body includes a plurality of cards to be inserted into the open section of the commander main body for controlling the operation of a plurality of electronic apparatus. King discloses a reconfigurable universal trainable transmitter includes a plurality of data modules to be inserted into electrical connectors of the trainable transmitter for controlling the operation of a plurality of electronic appratus. One of ordinary skilled in the art recognizes the need to have a plurality of electrical connectors to interface with plurality of removable plug-in data modules taught by King in a remote commander main body of Kurita because Kurita suggests it is desired to provide that the remote commander main body includes a plurality of connectors to connect with plurality of cards so that each card can be interchangeably (column 3 line 51 to column 4 line 48; see Figure 1) and King teaches that the trainable transmitter body has at least two electrical connectors for plurality of memory cards interchangeable (page 1 paragraph 0010 to page 2 paragraph 0018; see Figure 1) in order to provide convenience compatible with many home products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have a plurality of electrical connectors to interface with plurality of removable plug-in data modules taught by King in a remote commander main body of Kurita with the motivation for doing so would have been to provide a convenience to the consumer by allowing the remote command apparatus operates with a plurality of cards.

M

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600